1	Russell Davis (SBN 177959) PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE	
2	29 Lakewood Ave.	
3	San Francisco, CA 94127	
	Tel. (415) 310-6575 rdavis@pji.org	
4		
5	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SELINA KEENE, MELODY FOUNTILA, MARK) Case No.: 4:22-cv-01587-JSW
11	MCCLURE,)
12) PETITION TO VACATE RELATED) CASE STATUS OF THIS CASE TO
13	Plaintiffs,	OTHERS; OPPOSITION TO
14	v.) CONSOLIDATION
) 4:22-cv-06013-JSW
15	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;) 4:22-cv-04319-JSW) 4:22-cv-03975-JSW
16	LONDON BREED, Mayor of San Francisco in her	4:22-cv-07455-JSW
17	official capacity; CAROL ISEN Human Resources Director, City and County of San Francisco, in her) 4:22-cv-04633-JSW) 4:22-cv-07645-JSW
18	official capacity; DOES 1-100,) 4:23-cv-0/043-JSW
))) Dota: Ivno 22, 2022
19	Defendants.) Date: June 23, 2023 Time: 9:00 AM
20		Judge: The Honorable Jeffrey S. White
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	OPPOSITION TO CONSOLIDATION	

1 3

2

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Russell Davis declares:

- 1. I am the attorney of record for the Plaintiffs herein. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this matter and if called to testify regarding them I would and could do so competently.
- 2. On April 26, 2023, I filed a notice of unavailability (Docket no. 56). On 05/03/2023 defendant CCSF filed a motion to relate cases (Docket no. 61) while being either actually aware or constructively aware that opposing could not respond to its motion due to his vacation. On 05/08/2023, another member of my firm filed a request to continue the hearing on the administrative motion (Docket no. 62). The court entered an order relating cases on 06/05/2023 (Docket no. 67).
- 3. Wherefore this petition seeks to vacate the order granting related case status as to this case on grounds it was procedurally defective and violates the Plaintiffs' procedural due process rights. Additional grounds to vacate are that this case is procedurally far ahead of the other cases which have been related with it and it is unfair and prejudicial to the Plaintiffs herein to be tied to these other cases in any manner.
- 4. On May 15, 2023 (Docket no. 64), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals entered a Memorandum stating grounds for its remand of Plaintiffs Motion for Preliminary Injunction. On June 5, 2023, (Docket no. 71) that same court entered its Mandate, which constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.
- 5. As this case is subject to this court's further order re: the Ninth Circuit's Memorandum, it is also grounds to vacate the relation and to oppose consolidation. Any order consistent with the Ninth Circuit's ruling will obviate related case status and consolidation of this case with any other.

Wherefore Plaintiffs request the Court to vacate its order relating this case with others and to enter an order denying consolidation of this case with any other.

Dated: June 9, 2023

/s/ Russell Davis Russell Davis PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Attorney for Plaintiffs